

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/898,204	POYNOR, TODD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Leroy Maunu. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 10 June 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner has consulted Applicant for a possible changes to the claims as submitted. And Applicant's representative in response to the suggestion from Examiner to make the claim so that it reflects the parallel aspect of the message being directed for the normal operations of the kernel and the messages dedicated for debugging the kernel in view of the protocol stack implemented inside the network interface circuit using shared memory, has provided with proposed changes to the independent claims to put the claims in better condition for allowance..